

command room in one of these missile silos. I have been through this, and the fact is, there is a real system for ensuring that is not a hair trigger kind of a thing. It doesn't happen unless there is approval from three different areas before that happens. But more important than anything, I think it does really take from us the day-to-day deterrent that is out there, and the idea, of course, that if you only had a few missiles, we put your missiles in that place and do away with those—when you have them spread as we do now, basically about three different places land-based, then it is possible to do that.

I guess I am encouraged that we are talking about a missile defense system, that it would be there to augment the idea of maintaining our capacity to have this deterrence. I think it is terribly important that we do that as part of our strategy. We can move forward to reduce those numbers and get down to a START II agreement. I hope we do that.

We are going to be going forward, of course, on a number of things that all have to do with budgets, all have to do, then, with surpluses and taxes. These things are all related, of course, and should be. I am hopeful, frankly, from the standpoint of the budget, that the President pursues the idea that we ought to be able to have a budget that is basically inflation increases, which we overstepped last year substantially.

Occasionally, there are areas—certainly in health care—where we are going to want to expand. But I think regardless of the surplus it is important that we try to keep Government spending under control in some way. We seem to think if there is money, we ought to spend it. I think when you go out into the country and talk to people, they are very concerned about having a Federal Government that is continuously growing, that is more and more involved in our lives. And we would like to see these kinds of activities shifted back to the States, counties, and local governments, where government is closest to the people being governed.

So when we talk about budgets, we have to look at that in terms of the tax reductions. We are finding from the other side of the aisle a good deal of resistance to returning the money that people have overpaid in taxes to the people who paid it. That is a pretty stiff argument to undertake. We need, of course, to set up spending to pay down the debt. I think we have an opportunity to deal with these things in a balanced way so we can come out of this session of Congress—if we are really persuaded as to what we want to do, I hope we may give some thought, individually and collectively, to what we want to have accomplished when this session of Congress is over. What do we want to say we have done in terms of tax relief? What have we been able to accomplish? What do we want to say we have been able to do in terms of controlling spending? What are our

goals in terms of paying down the debt?

I think these are some of the things we talk about a great deal. We talk about them kind of independently and, obviously, everybody has a different idea, and that is legitimate. It seems to me that we ought to be able to establish fairly and collectively some goals, some vision of where we want to be, what we want to have accomplished when these 2 years are over, and then be able to measure the things we do against the attainment of those goals.

Unfortunately, I am afraid that, from time to time, it is not always the measurement of individual actions as to how they contribute to overall attainment. Will there be agreement on all of those things? Of course not. That is the nature of this place, the nature of any group that makes decisions. They don't all agree. They have different views and values, and we have to deal with that. There is nothing wrong with that. But we do want to be able to move toward accomplishing those things that we believe are good for the country, good for the long-term merits, and that, it seems to me, is our challenge.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I understand there have been speeches given this morning with respect to the military and the decision by President Bush to take a very serious look at what is happening in the military—a pause, if you will, in the funding and planning until we get our hands around exactly where things are.

I want to comment about the wisdom of that particular approach. If I may, I want to go back to the most inconsequential military career perhaps in the history of America—my own. It will demonstrate what happens in the military and demonstrate the power of inertia because once something gets started in one direction, it continues in that direction until some outside force is put upon it. That is not just Newton's law of motion; that is the law of motion in government as a whole.

I went into the military in 1957. I joined the Utah National Guard and was sent on active duty for training, first to Fort Ord, CA, and then, because my Guard unit was in the artillery observation business, to Fort Sill, OK.

I went to Fort Sill, OK, to be trained in sound ranging. If that does not mean anything to you, Mr. President, I would not be surprised because sound ranging is a military skill that reached its apex

of applicability in World War I. It had some applicability in World War II, very little in Korea, and virtually none in 1957 when I was trained in it.

But the inertia of the military organization was such that no one had reviewed the pattern of training people in sound ranging. So going forward, as a body in physics, moving in the same direction, it continued in the same direction. I and my fellow classmates were put through a program on sound ranging.

As it happened, I graduated first in my class. That is not as big an achievement as it might sound because I was the only member of the class who had been to college. I was a college graduate; the others were draftees who were high school graduates; and if I had not finished first, it would have been a disgrace.

Having finished first, once again the pattern of inertia in the military decreed that I should become an instructor and that the next sound ranging course that would go through Fort Sill, OK, would be taught by me. This is very flattering, except that my time on active duty with the National Guard would expire before the next class would convene.

I spent the remainder of my time in the day room, or at the post library, or doing other things because there was absolutely nothing for me to do. At the time I wondered: Doesn't anybody review these things? Doesn't anybody look at this and say: Wait a minute, this is a program that has long since outlived its usefulness, should be stopped, and we should just forget this?

No, nobody did. I got so bored, I went in and volunteered to teach other classes and had to go back to school, if you will, on my own time to learn logarithms so that I could teach that mathematical skill to the surveyors in the school. Basically, this was the least distinguished and least significant military career in American history, but it demonstrates what happens when we allow inertia to take over. We allow the military to go forward in one direction, and we do not ever stop and say: Wait a minute, are we doing the right thing?

Summarizing it another way, there are some historians who say the generals always fight the last war; they are always prepared for the last battle, not the battle that is to come.

The cold war is over. That is a cliché. Like most clichés, it happens to be true. Much of our military is geared towards fighting the cold war. Much of our military is geared towards a circumstance where the military commanders involved are comfortable with the way things are going because they are the way things have been.

The idea that there should be a careful look at where they are and a reassessment of the direction they are taking is a little bit threatening; it is unsettling; it implies uncertainty. The one thing many military men hate worse than anything else is uncertainty.

As I was going through the airport, flying back for this week's session, a book caught my eye. Tom Clancy is the author. We all know Tom Clancy. The reason it caught my eye was his mention of a military officer who had helped him write the book, a man named Chuck Horner. I met Chuck Horner when he was the commander of the U.S. Space Command, a four-star general located in Colorado Springs. He was the commander of the air war in the gulf. He was the top Air Force officer with respect to the Gulf War.

I found him fascinating, and when I saw his name on the cover of this book written by Tom Clancy, I decided to buy the book because I wanted to learn more about General Horner.

The reason I found him fascinating, among other things, was this statement he made to me during the time I spent with him. He said: The Gulf War was the first war fought from space. Tanks got positioned by virtue of instructions that came from space. Colin Powell said this is the war where the infantryman goes into the field with a rifle in one hand and a laptop in the other. Even that is now obsolete because he would take a palm pilot instead of a laptop; a laptop would be too cumbersome.

The Army, with its current advertising campaign, is beginning to talk about that. I am not sure it is the right advertising campaign—every soldier is an army of one—but it demonstrates how vastly changed things are.

Against that background where those things not only have changed but are changing, doesn't it make sense for the Secretary of Defense to say it is time for us to pause in the direction we are going in our procurement, in our threat assessment, in our strength establishment, and look toward the kind of military we are going to need in the future? Isn't it time for us to take a break when we do not have an immediate military threat and reassess from top to bottom everything we are doing?

I think it demonstrates the maturity of the Bush administration that Secretary Rumsfeld is engaged in this kind of activity. I think it demonstrates that the Bush administration has a very long-headed view of life; that they are not looking to this week or next week; they are not looking to the current polls; they are not looking to what might work in terms of a special interest group that has an attitude toward the military; they are saying: What does America need for the next decade? What kind of long-term decision can we make that will make America prepare for the different kind of threat we are facing? I think it means a military that will very quickly say we don't need any sound ranging classes, and we don't need any people sitting around with nothing to do. There is far too much to do in terms of planning and training and direction. I applaud President Bush for this decision, I applaud Secretary Rumsfeld for carrying it out, and I wish to make it

clear that this Senator will do everything he can to support and sustain this effort.

I yield the floor.

RECESS UNTIL 2:15 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 having arrived, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:31 p.m., recessed until 2:14 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. INHOFE).

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 2:45 p.m. shall be under the control of the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, or his designee.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate in morning business for no longer than 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire and Mr. KYL pertaining to the introduction of S. 305 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 3:15 shall be under the control of the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS, or his designee.

The Senator from Arizona.

NEED FOR MILITARY IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I would like to turn my attention this afternoon to something a little bit more immediate in terms of the Senate's actions. We all saw the news yesterday of the President's visit to Fort Stewart in Georgia. In fact, I spoke with a colleague of ours who had been with the President on that trip. She talked about the rather sorry state of the military barracks she visited, and the need for improvements to the military quality of life all around the country, exemplified by the President's visit to Fort Stewart.

As a result of his visit, the President has made some very forward-leaning announcements about improvement of the quality of life, including \$5.7 billion

in new spending—\$1.4 billion for military pay increases, \$400 million to improve military housing, \$3.9 billion to improve military health benefits, \$5.7 billion on new spending for the people in our military. I am certain that part of that will have to come through a so-called supplemental appropriations bill.

For those who are not totally familiar with the work of the Senate, ordinarily at about this time of the year, the Senate has to provide some infusion of cash to the military because of unforeseen expenditures and some that really were not so unforeseen but which were not budgeted for. For example, we know we will have to be in Bosnia and Kosovo and some other places in the world. Unfortunately, the previous administration never budgeted for those operations in advance, so the military had to pay for those operations out of hide.

They had to not buy certain spare parts, not sail ships during certain hours, not provide for maintenance of facilities and installations, deferring that for a later day, and use the money instead to support these operations abroad. Each year, we have had, therefore, a supplemental appropriations bill. Basically, the bill comes due. It has to be paid one way or another, sooner or later. We will have to do that same thing this year.

The President has decided to wait a little bit to make sure he knows exactly how much is needed. By the way, I hope President Bush will say to the Congress: I found out that we need exactly—and then give us the number. Let's assume it is \$5 billion, for the sake of argument—I would like the Congress to provide \$5 billion in supplemental appropriations to get our military through the end of the fiscal year. That is how much we need, and I will veto a bill that is a dollar less or a dollar more.

In other words, this should not become a Christmas tree for everyone's favorite project. I urge the President to give us an exact figure and tell us it is on our shoulders to pass that supplemental appropriations bill for him, for the military, and to reject any change we may make, therefore, removing the temptation some of our colleagues have to load those bills up with things that don't really pertain to necessities for the military.

I also want to suggest that we are going to need that supplemental appropriations bill not just for the quality of life of our military but for readiness. Certainly, the Presiding Officer knows this better than almost anybody in this body. Readiness has suffered during the last several years through a combination of two primary circumstances. One, we are deploying troops far more frequently and far-flung around the world than in the past. Two, we have cut the spending year after year, so we don't have the equipment in top shape to send where we need to send it, when we need to send it. Our troops are overstressed. The net result is readiness